

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 15-17 remain in the application and claim 1 has been amended hereby. Claims 8-14, and 18-46 have been cancelled, without prejudice ore disclaimer. New claims 47-49 have been added.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-5, 15-18, and 27-29 under 35 USC 102(e), as being unpatentable over Gerba et al.

Features of the information service method according to the present invention are that when a user selects while viewing a program a consumer commodity, information associated with the selected consumer commodity is displayed simultaneously on a child screen superimposed on the displayed program. See Fig. 3 of the present application, for example.

An advantage of these features of the present invention is that the user can continue to watch the program while obtaining more detailed information of a selected commodity.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite these features of the present invention.

Looking at Gerba et al. we see that there is no information associated with a selected consumer commodity being displayed simultaneously on a child screen superimposed on the displayed program. The screens taught by Gerba et al. are merely partitions of a full screen, that is, the full screen is separated into two or more screen areas. See col. 5, lines 54-62 of Gerba et al.

It is respectfully submitted that Gerba et al. is silent

about a child screen being superimposed on a displayed program.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 1, and the claims depending therefrom, are not anticipated by Gerba et al.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 6 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Gerba et al. in view of Burke.

Claim 6 depends from claim 1, which rejection over Gerba et al. has been addressed above and, because there are no features in Burke that somehow could be combined with Gerba et al. and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that claim 6 is patentably distinct over Gerba et al. in view of Burke.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed and is not seen to show or suggest the present invention as recited in the amended claims.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
COOPER & DUNHAM, LLP



Jay H. Maioli  
Reg. No. 27,213

JHM/PCF:pmc